

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 13, 2008, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-13 remain in this application with Claims 14-16 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Godbold for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 26, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as amended. The Examiner agreed to consider Applicants' arguments and stated that a further search may be required. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated June 13, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. Patent App. No. 2004/0039996 ("*Flam*") in view of "The Bidirectional Algorithm" ("*Davis*"). Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that it recites, "determining, by the computer system, the language of a first strong character in the plurality of characters encountered during the successive evaluation, wherein determining the language to the first strong character comprises identifying a code page comprising a character set associated with the language," and "establishing the reading order based upon a language corresponding to the first strong character, wherein establishing the reading order based upon the language comprises identifying the reading order established in the code page associated with the language." Amended Claims 7 and 13 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least at page 5, line 28 - page 6, line 7.

In contrast, *Flam* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Flam* discloses selecting text using a pointing device so that an applet restores characters to their appropriate form and order. (See *Flam*, para. [0015].) In *Flam*, a mouse is used to select a "switch" button that reverses the Hebrew letters' order while Latin characters in a window are not reversed. (See *Flam*, para. [0062].) After the button has been selected, each new keystroke causes a corresponding character to be displayed to the left of a last line appearing in the window. (See *Flam*, para. [0057].) In *Flam*, a message's characters are not evaluated in turn to look for a strong, alphabetic character. Also, as the Examiner states, *Flam* does not disclose determining the language of a first strong character in the plurality of characters. (See Office Action, page 6, lines 8-12.) Rather, *Flam* merely discloses a button for selecting an order in which text should be displayed.

Furthermore, *Davis* does not overcome *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Davis* merely discloses ordering codes to signal text directional formatting. (See *Davis*, page 5.) These codes are designed to be equivalently represented by out-of-line information, such as stylesheet information. (See *Davis*, page 6.) *Davis* further discloses light-weight codes that do not display or have any other semantic effect. (See *Davis*, page 7.) *Davis* discloses that bidirectional character types may be associated with a scope, and that the scope encompasses characters and/or alphabets associated with a plurality of languages, such as Type "L" being associated with most alphabetic characters and Type "AL" being associated with Arabic, Thaana, and Syriac alphabets. (See *Davis*, Table 3-7.) Nowhere, however, does *Davis* disclose identifying the specific human language of the character and deriving a reading order according to a code sheet associated with the language. Rather, *Davis* merely discloses that a character type may be associated with multiple languages using a reading order instead of deriving the reading order from an identified language.

Combining *Flam* with *Davis* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Flam* and *Davis*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "determining, by the computer system, the language of a first strong character in the plurality of characters encountered during the successive evaluation, wherein determining the language to the first strong character comprises identifying a code page comprising a character set associated with the language," and "establishing the reading order based upon a language corresponding to the first strong character, wherein establishing the reading order based upon the language comprises identifying the reading order established in the code page associated with the language," as recited by

amended Claim 1. Claims 7 and 13 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, and 13 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 7, and 13.

Dependent Claims 5-6 and 11-12 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 7, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 5-6 and 11-12.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: September 15, 2008

By: /D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:sm

